## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of North Carolina

United States of America			
V. )	Case No:	DNCW394CR000147-002 11313-058	
Date of Original Judgment: October 12, 1995	USM No:		
	<u> </u>		
	Pro se Defendant's Attorney		
	Defendant 5 7 to	orney	
Order Regarding Motion for Sentence Redu	ction Pursua	ant to 18 U.S.C	C. § 3582(c)(2)
Upon motion of ■ the defendant □ the Director of § 3582(c)(2) for a reduction in the term of imprisonment impose subsequently been lowered and made retroactive by the United § 994(u), and having considered such motion, and taking into ac and the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), to the	ed based on a States Senten ccount the po	guideline sent cing Commissi licy statement	encing range that has ion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. set forth at USSG §1B1.10
IT IS ORDERED that the motion is:			
■ DENIED. □ GRANTED and the defendant's pre			
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		d to	
Criminal History Category: VI	Amended Of Criminal His	fense Level: tory Category:	31 VI 188-235 months
<ul> <li>□ The reduced sentence is within the amended guideline range.</li> <li>□ The previous term of imprisonment imposed was less than the of sentencing and the reduced sentence is comparably less the of the reduced sentence is above the amended guideline range.</li> <li>■ Other (explain): Since this offense did not involve crack code.</li> </ul>	ne guideline ra an the amend	ed guideline ra	inge.
III. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS			
Except as provided above, all provisions of the judgment dated	October 12	2, 1995 s	hall remain in effect.
IT IS SO ORDERED.			
Order Date: June 27, 2012	Haha	m C. V	Juffen
Effective Date:	Graham C. United State	Mullen es District Judg	e